

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO**

---

ISRAEL ORNELAS, and  
ALFREDO GRIEGO,

Plaintiffs,

v.

No. 24-cv-0612-WJ-SCY

STATE OF NM, *et al.*,

Defendants.

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on the *pro se* Prisoner Civil Rights Complaint filed by two inmate-plaintiffs: Israel Ornelas and Alfredo Griego. *See* Doc. 1 (Complaint). The pleading purports to raise civil rights claims challenging the inmates' prison classification and conditions of confinement. As an initial matter, the Court must determine whether it is feasible or permissible for multiple *pro se* plaintiffs to prosecute this case.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 20 governs the joinder of multiple plaintiffs. The Court, in its discretion, may permit a joinder where all claims arise from the same transaction/occurrence and share at least one question of law or fact. *See* Rule 20(a)(1); *Hefley v. Textron, Inc.*, 713 F.2d 1487, 1499 (10th Cir. 1983) (permissive joinder is a matter of discretion).

Even where these requirements are met, the Court may disallow a joinder based on the inherent impracticalities associated with *pro se* prisoner litigation. *See Bourn v. Geo Grp., Inc.*, 2012 WL 451286, at \*2 (D. Colo. Feb. 13, 2012) ("Many federal district courts have found that the pervasive impracticalities associated with multiple-plaintiff prisoner litigation militate against

permissive joinder otherwise allowed by Fed. R. Civ. P. 20(a)(1)"); *Ricky L. Hollins, et al., v. KDOC Staff, et al.*, 2024 WL 4836237, at \*3 (D. Kan. Nov. 20, 2024) ("In the context of prisoner litigation specifically, district courts also have found that the impracticalities inherent in multiple-plaintiff lawsuits militate against permissive joinder otherwise allowed by Rule 20(a)(1)"); *Adams v. GEO Grp., Inc.*, 2021 WL 2407436, at \*1 (W.D. Okla. Apr. 13, 2021) (same); *Bastian v. Jaramillo*, 2023 WL 4182806, at \*2 (D.N.M. June 21, 2023) (same). If multiple plaintiffs proceed in one case, for example, "any pleading filed [would need to] bear [each of] their signatures pursuant to [Fed. R. Civ. P.] 11(a)." *Bastian*, 2023 WL 4182806, at \*2. Prison transfers "could, at any time, restrict interpersonal communication between Plaintiffs," preventing "them from ... conferring with one another, reviewing proposed pleadings [to comply with Rule 11], and ... meet[ing] the court's deadlines." *Dill v. Thomas*, 2023 WL 8115921, at \*1–2 (W.D. Okla. Oct. 31, 2023). See also *Pinson v. Whetsel*, 2007 WL 428191, at \*1 (W.D. Okla. Feb. 1, 2007) ("If one inmate is moved during the course of the litigation, the court may find itself in the position of ordering prison officials to allow co-plaintiff inmates to correspond with each other, in derogation of a ... legitimate prison policy.").

"A prisoner litigating jointly under Rule 20 [also] takes th[e] risks for *all* claims in the complaint, whether or not they concern him personally." *Boriboune v. Berge*, 391 F.3d 852, 855 (7th Cir. 2004) (emphasis in original). This means that if the inmate-plaintiffs are proceeding *in forma pauperis* – which is true in the vast majority of cases – they could all accrue strikes under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) if the complaint is dismissed for failure to state a cognizable claim. *Id.* (explaining the risk that one plaintiff would accrue a strike by signing another plaintiff's filing); 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) (noting inmate-plaintiffs accrue a strike each time their case is dismissed for failure to state a cognizable claim and that they cannot proceed *in forma pauperis* after accruing

three strikes). Finally, “multiple-plaintiff prisoner litigation also raises concerns that *pro se* prisoner plaintiffs might be seeking to impermissibly provide legal assistance to each other in pursuing their claims.” *Hunnicutt v. Smith*, 2021 WL 3618315, at \*20–21 (D.N.M. Aug. 16, 2021) (quotations omitted).

The filings here implicate a number of these concerns. The Complaint challenges Plaintiffs’ prison classification and parole status, which is generally unique to each inmate. Moreover, both Plaintiffs have severed contact with the Court following their release from the Guadalupe County Correctional Facility. *See* <https://www.cd.nm.gov/offender-search/> (last visited May 12, 2025). It is therefore unclear whether Plaintiffs are still able or inclined to prosecute this action together.

For these reasons, the Court finds joinder is impractical in this case. Because there is no primary filer and both Plaintiffs have severed contact with the Court, the case will be dismissed without prejudice. *See Ricky L. Hollins, et al., v. KDOC Staff, et al.*, 2024 WL 4836237, at \*3 (D. Kan. Nov. 20, 2024) (noting the case featuring multiple inmate-plaintiffs “may not proceed as filed and is dismissed without prejudice”). Each Plaintiff may file a new case limited to their own claims, if they wish to continue litigating.

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Prisoner Civil Rights Complaint (**Doc. 1**) filed by Israel Ornelas and Alfredo Griego is **DISMISSED without prejudice**; and the Court will enter a separate judgment closing the civil case.

**SO ORDERED.**

/s/

---

WILLIAM P. JOHNSON  
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE